

OPTIMAL CO-ADAPTED COUPLING FOR A RANDOM WALK ON THE HYPER-COMPLETE-GRAPH

BY STEPHEN B. CONNOR

University of York

Abstract Let G_d be the complete graph with d vertices, and let X and Y be two simple symmetric continuous-time random walks on the vertices of G_d^n . When $d = 2$, X and Y are random walks on the hypercube $\mathbb{Z}_2^n$, for which a stochastically fastest co-adapted coupling is described in (2). Here we extend this result to random walks on G_d^n , once again producing a stochastically optimal coupling: as $d \rightarrow \infty$ we show that this optimal co-adapted coupling tends to a *maximal* coupling.

1. Introduction. Let G_d be the complete graph with d vertices, $d \geq 2$, and let G_d^n be the set of n -tuples of the form $(x(1), \dots, x(n))$ with $x(i) \in G_d$, $1 \leq i \leq n$. G_d^n forms a group under coordinate-wise addition modulo d , and $G_2^n \cong \mathbb{Z}_2^n$. For $i = 1, \dots, n$ we define $e_i \in G_d^n$ to satisfy $e_i(k) = \mathbf{1}_{[i=k]}$, where $\mathbf{1}_{[\cdot]}$ denotes the indicator function. For $x, y \in G_d^n$, let $|x - y|$ denote the Hamming distance between x and y . (In particular, $|x|$ equals the number of non-zero coordinates of x .)

Let Λ_i , $1 \leq i \leq n$, be independent unit-rate marked Poisson processes on $[0, \infty)$, with marks distributed uniformly on the set $\{1, \dots, d-1\}$. A simple symmetric continuous-time random walk X on G_d^n may be defined by increasing the i^{th} coordinate of X by $k \pmod{d}$ at incident times of Λ_i for which the corresponding mark is equal to k . We write $\mathcal{L}(X_t)$ for the law of X at time t . The unique equilibrium distribution of X is the uniform distribution on G_d^n .

Suppose that we now wish to couple two such processes, X and Y , starting from different states.

AMS 2000 subject classifications: Primary 93E20; secondary 60J27

Keywords and phrases: Optimal coupling, co-adapted, stochastic minimum, random walk, cutoff phenomenon

DEFINITION 1.1. A *coupling* of X and Y is a process (X^c, Y^c) on $G_d^n \times G_d^n$ such that

$$X^c \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} X \quad \text{and} \quad Y^c \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} Y.$$

In this paper we will be primarily concerned with *co-adapted* couplings:

DEFINITION 1.2. A coupling (X^c, Y^c) is called *co-adapted* if there exists a filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ such that

1. X^c and Y^c are both adapted to $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$;
2. for any $0 \leq s \leq t$,

$$\mathcal{L}(X_t^c | \mathcal{F}_s) = \mathcal{L}(X_t^c | X_s^c) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L}(Y_t^c | \mathcal{F}_s) = \mathcal{L}(Y_t^c | Y_s^c).$$

In other words, (X^c, Y^c) is co-adapted if X^c and Y^c are both Markov with respect to a common filtration, $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$. We denote by $\mathcal{C}$ the set of all co-adapted couplings of X and Y . For $t \geq 0$, let

$$U_t^c = \{1 \leq i \leq n : X_t^c(i) \neq Y_t^c(i)\}, \quad \text{and} \quad M_t^c = \{1 \leq i \leq n : X_t^c(i) = Y_t^c(i)\}$$

respectively denote the set of unmatched and matched coordinates at time t . We define the coupling time by

$$\tau^c = \inf \{t \geq 0 : X_s^c = Y_s^c \ \forall s \geq t\} = \inf \{t \geq 0 : U_s^c = \emptyset \ \forall s \geq t\}.$$

If (X^c, Y^c) is co-adapted then τ^c is a randomised stopping time with respect to the individual chains.

In (2), an explicit, intuitive coupling strategy is described when $d = 2$, and is shown to yield the stochastically minimal coupling time of all co-adapted couplings. This coupling strategy at time t depends only on the parity of $N_t = |U_t|$, and may be summarised as follows:

- matched coordinates are always made to move synchronously;
- if N is odd, all unmatched coordinates of X and Y are made to evolve independently until N becomes even;
- if N is even, unmatched coordinates are coupled in pairs – when an unmatched coordinate on X flips (thereby making a new match), a different unmatched coordinate on Y is flipped at the same instant (making a total of two new matches).

The work of (2) motivates the following question: what is the optimal co-adapted coupling when $d > 2$? Intuitively, we expect the optimal strategy when $d = 2$ to become inefficient as d gets large: the rate at which unmatched coordinates can be made to agree using either ‘independent’ or ‘pairwise’ coupling (as described above) is proportional to N/d . In Sections 2 and 3 we show how to describe the problem of finding an optimal co-adapted coupling as an exercise in optimal stochastic control (generalizing the idea used in (2)), and solve this problem to once again produce a stochastically minimal coupling time; some of the longer proofs can be found in Section 5. In Section 4 we study the behaviour of this coupling as $d \rightarrow \infty$ and show that, for fixed n , the optimal co-adapted coupling tends to a *maximal* coupling.

2. Co-adapted couplings for random walks on G_d^n . In order to find the optimal co-adapted coupling of X and Y , it is first necessary to be able to describe a general coupling strategy $c \in \mathcal{C}$. To this end, let $\Lambda_{(i,k)(j,l)}$ ($1 \leq i, j \leq n$ and $1 \leq k, l \leq d$) be independent marked Poisson processes on $[0, \infty)$, each of rate $(d-1)^{-1}$, and with marks $W_{(i,k)(j,l)} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \text{Uniform}[0, 1]$. We let $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be any filtration satisfying

$$\sigma \left\{ \bigcup_{i,j,k,l} \Lambda_{(i,k)(j,l)}(s), \bigcup_{i,j,k,l} W_{(i,k)(j,l)}(s) : s \leq t \right\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_t, \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

The transitions of X^c and Y^c will be driven by the marked Poisson processes, and controlled by a process $\{Q^c(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ which is adapted to $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$. Here,

$$Q^c(t) = \left\{ q_{(r,s)}^c(t) : 1 \leq r, s \leq nd \right\}$$

is a $(nd) \times (nd)$ doubly-stochastic matrix.

A similar argument to that in (2) shows that a general co-adapted coupling for X and Y may be defined as follows: if there is a jump in the process $\Lambda_{(i,k)(j,l)}$ at time $t \geq 0$, and the mark $W_{(i,k)(j,l)}(t)$ satisfies $W_{(i,k)(j,l)}(t) \leq q_{([i-1]d+k, [j-1]d+l)}^c(t)$, then set $X_t^c(i) = k$ and $Y_t^c(j) = l$. To ease notation, in the sequel we shall write $q_{(ik),(jl)}^c(t)$ instead of $q_{([i-1]d+k, [j-1]d+l)}^c(t)$: thus $q_{(ik),(jl)}^c(t)$ is proportional to the instantaneous rate at which $(X_t^c(i), Y_t^c(j))$ jumps to (k, l) .

Note that if $k = X_{t-}^c(i)$ and the ‘move’ is accepted, there is no change to the value of $X^c(i)$ at time t : thus this setup allows for the possibility of a jump taking place on only one process at any given instant. Furthermore, the total rate at which $X_t^c(i)$ *changes value* is given by

$$\frac{1}{d-1} \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbf{1}_{[k \neq X_{t-}^c(i)]} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^d q_{(i,k)(j,l)}^c(t) \right) = 1,$$

since the bracketed double sum is simply that of the $([i-1]d+k)^{th}$ row of $Q^c(t)$, and hence equal to one. Similarly, the rate at which $X^c(i)$ changes from r to $r+k \pmod{d}$, $1 \leq k \leq d-1$, is equal to

$$\frac{1}{d-1} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^d q_{(i,r+k)(j,l)}^c(t) = \frac{1}{d-1}.$$

From this construction it follows directly that X^c and Y^c both have the correct marginal transition rates to be continuous-time simple random walks on G_d^m as described in Section 1, and are co-adapted.

3. Optimal coupling. Our proposed optimal coupling $\hat{c}_d$ once again depends upon the parity of N_t , the number of unmatched coordinates of X and Y at time t . It now also depends upon how this number relates to the parameter d .

DEFINITION 3.1. The matrix process $\hat{Q}$ corresponding to the coupling $\hat{c}_d$ is as follows:

[C1] $\hat{q}_{(i,k)(i,k)}(t) = 1$ for all $i \in M_t$ and all $k = 1, \dots, d$;

[C2] if N_t is even, or $N_t \geq 2(d-1)/(d-2)$: for $i, j \in U_t$,

$$(i) \quad \hat{q}_{(i,k)(j,l)}(t) = \left(\frac{1}{N_t-1} \right) \mathbf{1}_{[j \neq i]} \mathbf{1}_{[k=Y_{t-}(i), l=X_{t-}(j)]};$$

$$(ii) \quad \hat{q}_{(i,k)(i,k)}(t) = \mathbf{1}_{[k \neq X_{t-}(i), k \neq Y_{t-}(i)]};$$

[C3] if N_t is odd and $N_t < 2(d-1)/(d-2)$, then $\hat{q}_{(i,k)(i,k)}(t) = 1$ for all $i \in U_t$ and all $k = 1, \dots, d$.

Part [C1] of this definition ensures that no matches are ever broken under $\hat{c}_d$. The final two items define the strategy for making new matches. If N_t is

even, or else sufficiently large, we will see that [C2](i) implies that the rate at which two new matches are made is maximised; [C2](ii) then maximises the rate at which a single new match is made, subject to the constraint imposed by [C2](i). Finally, [C3] implies that if N_t is odd, with $N_t < 2(d-1)/(d-2)$, the coupling maximises the rate at which single matches are made. (Note that if $d = 2$, [C3] applies whenever N_t is odd; if $d = 3$ then it applies when $N_t \in \{1, 3\}$; while if $d \geq 4$, [C3] applies only when $N_t = 1$.)

Informally, $\hat{c}_d$ couples X and Y as follows when $d \geq 4$ and $N_t \geq 2$. If an unmatched coordinate $X(i)$ jumps to state k at time t , then:

- if $Y_{t-}(i) = k$ (which occurs with probability $1/d$), choose another unmatched coordinate j uniformly at random, and set $Y_t(j) = X_{t-}(j)$ – this decreases N by two;
- if $Y_{t-}(i) \neq k$, set $Y_t(i) = k$ – this decreases N by one.

Now define

$$(3.1) \quad \hat{v}_d(x, y, t) = \mathbb{P}[\hat{\tau}_d > t \mid X_0 = x, Y_0 = y]$$

to be the tail probability of the coupling time under $\hat{c}_d$. The main result of this paper is the following generalisation of (2, Theorem 3.1).

THEOREM 3.2. *For any states $x, y \in G_d^n$ and time $t \geq 0$,*

$$(3.2) \quad \hat{v}_d(x, y, t) = \inf_{c \in \mathcal{C}} \mathbb{P}[\tau^c > t \mid X_0 = x, Y_0 = y] .$$

In other words, $\hat{\tau}_d$ is the stochastic minimum of all co-adapted coupling times for the pair (X, Y) .

From Definition 3.1 it is evident that $\hat{c}_d$ is invariant under coordinate permutation, and that $\hat{v}_d(x, y, t)$ only depends on (x, y) through $|x - y|$, and so we shall usually write

$$\hat{v}_d(m, t) = \mathbb{P}[\hat{\tau}_d > t \mid N_0 = m] ,$$

with the convention that $\hat{v}_d(m, t) = 0$ for $m \leq 0$.

As in (2), we shall write $\lambda_t^c(m, m+s)$ for the rate (according to $Q^c(t)$) at which N_t^c jumps from m to $m+s$, for $s \in \{-2, \dots, 2\}$. For example:

$$(3.3) \quad (d-1)\lambda_t^c(m, m-2) = \sum_{\substack{i,j \in U_t \\ i \neq j}} q_{(i,k)(j,l)}^c(t) \mathbf{1}_{[k=Y_{t-}(i), l=X_{t-}(j)]}$$

and

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} (d-1)\lambda_t^c(m, m-1) = & \sum_{i \in U_t} \sum_{1 \leq k \leq d} q_{(i,k)(i,k)}^c(t) \\ & + \sum_{\substack{i,j \in U_t \\ i \neq j}} \sum_{1 \leq l, k \leq d} q_{(i,k)(j,l)}^c(t) \left(\mathbf{1}_{[k=Y_{t-}(i), l \neq X_{t-}(j)]} + \mathbf{1}_{[k \neq Y_{t-}(i), l=X_{t-}(j)]} \right) \\ & + \sum_{\substack{i \in U_t \\ j \in M_t}} \sum_{1 \leq l, k \leq d} q_{(i,k)(j,l)}^c(t) \mathbf{1}_{[k=Y_{t-}(i), l=Y_{t-}(j)]} \\ & + \sum_{\substack{i \in M_t \\ j \in U_t}} \sum_{1 \leq l, k \leq d} q_{(i,k)(j,l)}^c(t) \mathbf{1}_{[k=X_{t-}(i), l=X_{t-}(j)]}. \end{aligned}$$

The expression for $\lambda_t^c(m, m-2)$ is easy to understand: N_t^c decreases by two if and only if different unmatched coordinates on X and Y flip at the same instant, with each flip making one new match.

$\lambda_t^c(m, m-1)$ comprises four sums however, and so requires a little more explanation. The first sum in (3.4) gives the rate at which the same unmatched coordinate flips on both X and Y to the same value, making one new match. The second term is the rate at which an unmatched coordinate on one process flips to make a new match, while a different unmatched coordinate on the other process flips *without* making another new match. Finally, the third and fourth sums in (3.4) give the rate at which an unmatched coordinate on one process flips and makes a new match, while on the other process a matched coordinate is selected and made to stay at its current value.

Similar decompositions may be written down for $\lambda_t^c(m, m+1)$ and $\lambda_t^c(m, m+2)$, but we will have no need of them in the sequel.

Using the constraints on the row and column sums of Q_t^c , the first of these terms may be bounded as follows:

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} (d-1)\lambda_t^c(m, m-2) &= \sum_{\substack{i,j \in U_t \\ i \neq j}} q_{(i,k)(j,l)}^c(t) \mathbf{1}_{[k=Y_{t-}(i)]} \mathbf{1}_{[l=X_{t-}(j)]} \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in U_t} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^d q_{(i,k)(j,l)}^c(t) \right) = |U_t| = m. \end{aligned}$$

Similar simple bounds on the sums in (3.4) show that $0 \leq (d-1)\lambda_t^c(m, m-1) \leq md$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} (d-1)\lambda_t^c(m, m-1) + 2(d-1)\lambda_t^c(m, m-2) &\leq \sum_{i \in U_t} \left(\sum_{k=1}^d q_{(i,k)(j,l)}^c(t) \mathbf{1}_{[k \neq X_{t-}(i), k \neq Y_{t-}(i)]} \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \in U_t} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^d q_{(i,k)(j,l)}^c(t) \left(\mathbf{1}_{[j \neq i]} + \mathbf{1}_{[j=i, l=Y_{t-}(i)]} \right) \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j \in U_t} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d q_{(i,k)(j,l)}^c(t) \left(\mathbf{1}_{[i \neq j]} + \mathbf{1}_{[i=j, k=X_{t-}(j)]} \right) \right) \\ &\leq m(d-2) + m + m = md. \end{aligned}$$

Denote by L_d^n the set of nonnegative λ satisfying the linear constraint

$$(3.6) \quad (d-1)\lambda(m, m-1) + 2(d-1)\lambda(m, m-2) \leq md.$$

When $d = 2$ this reduces to the constraint of (2): $\lambda(m, m-1) + 2\lambda(m, m-2) \leq 2m$.

PROPOSITION 3.3. *Under $\hat{c}_d$ the following set of equations hold:*

$$(3.7) \quad \lambda_t^{\hat{c}_d}(m, m+1) = \lambda_t^{\hat{c}_d}(m, m+2) = 0;$$

if m is even, or if $m \geq 2(d-1)/(d-2)$ then

$$(3.8) \quad (d-1)\lambda_t^{\hat{c}_d}(m, m-2) = m \quad \text{and} \quad (d-1)\lambda_t^{\hat{c}_d}(m, m-1) = m(d-2);$$

if m is odd and $m < 2(d-1)/(d-2)$ then

$$(3.9) \quad \lambda_t^{\hat{c}_d}(m, m-2) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (d-1)\lambda_t^{\hat{c}_d}(m, m-1) = md.$$

(See Section 5 for the proof.) It follows that the upper bound of (3.6) is always attained under $\hat{c}_d$. Although the framework laid out above for describing a general coupling $c \in \mathcal{C}$ differs from the setup in (2), we can immediately obtain the result of that paper:

COROLLARY 3.4. *Theorem 3.2 holds when $d = 2$.*

PROOF. When $d = 2$, Proposition 3.3 shows that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_t^{\hat{c}_d}(m, m+1) &= \lambda_t^{\hat{c}_d}(m, m+2) = 0, \\ \lambda_t^{\hat{c}_d}(2m, 2m-2) &= 2m, \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_t^{\hat{c}_d}(2m-1, 2m-2) = 2(2m-1).\end{aligned}$$

The optimality of $\hat{c}_d$ when $d = 2$ now follows from the proof of Theorem 3.1 of (2). $\square$

For a strategy $c \in \mathcal{C}$, define the process S_t^c by

$$S_t^c = \hat{v}_d(X_t^c, Y_t^c, T-t),$$

where $T > 0$ is some fixed time. This is the conditional probability of X and Y not having coupled by time T , when strategy c has been followed over the interval $[0, t]$ and $\hat{c}_d$ has then been used from time t onwards.

Now, (point process) stochastic calculus yields:

$$(3.10) \quad dS_t^c = dZ_t^c + \left(\mathcal{A}_t^c \hat{v}_d - \frac{\partial \hat{v}_d}{\partial t} \right) dt,$$

where Z_t^c is a martingale, and $\mathcal{A}_t^c$ is the “generator” corresponding to the matrix $Q^c(t)$. Due to the independence of the Poisson processes $\Lambda_{(i,k)(j,l)}$, for any function $f : G_d^n \times G_d^n \times \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{A}_t^c$ satisfies

$$\mathcal{A}_t^c f(x, y, t) = \frac{1}{d-1} \sum_{i,j} \sum_{k,l} q_{(i,k)(j,l)}^c(t) \left[f(x + [k-x(i)]e_i, y + [l-y(j)]e_j, t) - f(x, y, t) \right].$$

Since $\hat{v}_d$ is invariant under coordinate permutation, if $|x - y| = m$ then

$$\mathcal{A}_t^c \hat{v}_d(m, t) = \sum_{s=-2}^2 \lambda_t^c(m, m+s) [\hat{v}_d(m+s, t) - \hat{v}_d(m, t)].$$

As in (2), the optimality of $\hat{c}_d$ will follow by Bellman's principle (8) if it can be shown that $S_{t \wedge \tau^c}^c$ is a submartingale for all $c \in \mathcal{C}$ (where $s \wedge t = \min\{s, t\}$). This in turn follows if we can show that $\mathcal{A}_t^c \hat{v}_d$ is minimised by setting $c = \hat{c}_d$ (since $\mathcal{A}_t^{\hat{c}_d} \hat{v}_d - \partial \hat{v}_d / \partial t = 0$). Thus we seek to maximise over $\lambda \in L_d^n$, for all $m \geq 0$ and all $t \geq 0$,

$$(3.11) \quad \sum_{s=-2}^2 \lambda(m, m+s) [\hat{v}_d(m, t) - \hat{v}_d(m+s, t)] .$$

Our first step is to simplify this maximisation problem by showing that $\hat{v}_d(m, t)$ is strictly increasing in m . Define $r_d(m, t) = \hat{v}_d(m, t) - \hat{v}_d(m-1, t)$. The proof of the following result can be found in Section 5.

LEMMA 3.5. *The tail probability $\hat{v}_d(m, t)$ is strictly increasing in m .*

Thus $r_d(m, t) \geq 0$ for all $m \geq 0$ and $t \geq 0$. It follows that the terms appearing on the right-hand-side of equation (3.11) are nonpositive if and only if s is nonnegative. Hence we must set

$$\lambda(m, m+1) = \lambda(m, m+2) = 0$$

in order to achieve the maximum in (3.11) It therefore now suffices to maximise

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda(m, m-2) [\hat{v}_d(m, t) - \hat{v}_d(m-2, t)] + \lambda(m, m-1) [\hat{v}_d(m, t) - \hat{v}_d(m-1, t)] \\ &= \lambda(m, m-2) [r_d(m, t) + r_d(m-1, t)] + \lambda(m, m-1) r_d(m, t) \end{aligned}$$

subject to the constraint from (3.6):

$$(d-1)\lambda(m, m-1) + 2(d-1)\lambda(m, m-2) \leq md .$$

Putting these together we see that we need to maximise (for $m \geq 2$)

$$(3.12) \quad \lambda(m, m-2) [r_d(m-1, t) - r_d(m, t)] .$$

THEOREM 3.6. *For all $d \geq 4$, $m \geq 2$ and $t \geq 0$, $r_d(m-1, t) \geq r_d(m, t)$.*

(See Section 5 for the proof.) This result allows us to finally complete the proof of Theorem 3.2 when $d \geq 4$. (The proof for $d = 3$ follows a similar line of argument, using an amended version of Theorem 3.6.)

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.2 ($d \geq 4$).

When $d \geq 4$, Theorem 3.6 and the preceding discussion show that the optimal strategy must maximise $\lambda(m, m-2)$ for $m \geq 2$. Using the bounds in (3.5) and (3.6), it follows that this is equivalent to requiring

$$(d-1)\lambda(m, m-2) = m \quad \text{and} \quad (d-1)\lambda(m, m-1) = m(d-2).$$

But by Proposition 3.3, this is in complete agreement with the rates $\lambda_t^{\hat{c}_d}$ arising from using our candidate optimal strategy, $\hat{c}_d$. Thus $\hat{c}_d$ is truly an optimal co-adapted coupling, as claimed. $\square$

4. Limiting behaviour. In this section we briefly consider the limiting behaviour of the coupling time $\hat{\tau}_d$ of the optimal co-adapted coupling, both as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $d \rightarrow \infty$. Recall that the coupling inequality bounds the tail distribution of *any* coupling of X and Y by the total variation distance between the two processes (9):

$$(4.1) \quad \|\mathcal{L}(X_t) - \mathcal{L}(Y_t)\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \mathbb{P}[\tau > t].$$

Furthermore, due to the general results of (7; 10), there exists a maximal coupling c^* – one whose coupling time τ^* achieves equality in (4.1). Such a coupling is not, in general, co-adapted. A natural question is whether the optimal co-adapted coupling for (X, Y) described in the previous section is also maximal. (This was answered in the negative by Connor & Jacka (2) when $d = 2$.)

First suppose that d is fixed. Denote by π_d the uniform distribution on G_d^n (recall that π_d is the equilibrium distribution of X), and by τ_d^* the coupling time of a maximal coupling for the chains (X, Y) where $X_0 = \mathbf{0}$ and $Y_0 \sim \pi_d$. The following result is a simple generalisation of (5, Proposition 1):

LEMMA 4.1. *Let*

$$T_d = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{d-1}{d} \right) \log n.$$

Then as $n \rightarrow \infty$, for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$(4.2) \quad \|\mathcal{L}(X_{T_d+\theta}) - \pi_d\|_{\text{TV}} = 2\Phi\left(\frac{\sqrt{d-1}}{2} e^{-d\theta/(d-1)}\right) - 1 + o(1),$$

where $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the standard normal distribution function.

This shows that the distance between $\mathcal{L}(X)$ and π_d exhibits a *cutoff phenomenon* (1; 3; 4) at time T_d . Thus $\mathbb{E}[\tau_d^*] \sim T_d < \frac{1}{2} \log n$.

We can bound $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\tau}_d]$ as follows. Under $\hat{c}$, $\hat{N} = N^{\hat{c}}$ is a decreasing process, with jumps being of size -1 or -2. Suppose that $\hat{N} = 2m$ and hence is even. Then the total rate at which $\hat{N}$ jumps is equal (by [C2]) to

$$(4.3) \quad \lambda_t^{\hat{c}}(2m, 2m-2) + \lambda_t^{\hat{c}}(2m, 2m-1) = \frac{2m}{d-1} + \frac{2m(d-2)}{d-1} = 2m = \hat{N}.$$

For $k = 1, 2$, let M^k be a process that takes only steps of size $-k$ at rate M^k , and let τ^k be the time taken for M^k to be absorbed at zero. If $\hat{N}_0 = M_0^k = 2m$ then $\mathbb{E}[\tau^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[\hat{\tau}_d] \leq \mathbb{E}[\tau^1]$, thanks to Lemma 3.5. Furthermore,

$$\mathbb{E}[\tau^k | M_0^k = 2m] = \sum_{i=1}^m (ki)^{-1} \sim \frac{1}{k} \log m.$$

Averaging over the starting state of Y_0 we see that

$$\frac{1}{2} \log n \leq \mathbb{E}[\hat{\tau}_d] \leq \log n \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Therefore $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\tau}_d] > \mathbb{E}[\tau_d^*]$, and so the optimal co-adapted coupling is not maximal for any fixed d .

Let us now consider what happens if we let $d \rightarrow \infty$ while keeping n fixed. Suppose that the d points of G_d are equally spaced on the unit interval $[0, 1)$, at locations $\{0, d^{-1}, d^{-2}, \dots\}$. As $d \rightarrow \infty$ the random walk X on G_d^n , with $X_0 = \mathbf{0}$, converges in distribution to the random walk $\tilde{X}$ on $[0, 1)^n$ for which each coordinate jumps, at incident times of an independent unit-rate Poisson process, to a new location distributed uniformly on $[0, 1)$. The equilibrium distribution of $\tilde{X}$ is of course $\pi_\infty^n = \text{Uniform}[0, 1)^{\otimes n}$. Let $\tilde{Y}_0 \sim \pi_\infty^n$.

LEMMA 4.2. *For n fixed, as $d \rightarrow \infty$ the optimal co-adapted coupling $\hat{c}_d$ of Section 3 tends to a maximal coupling.*

PROOF. Let A_0 be the set of points in $[0, 1)^n$ which have at least one

coordinate equal to 0. Then, by definition of total variation distance,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{L}(\tilde{X}_t) - \pi_\infty^n\|_{\text{TV}} &= \sup_{A \subset [0,1]^n} \left(\mathbb{P}[\tilde{X}_t \in A] - \pi_\infty^n(A) \right) \\
&= \mathbb{P}[\tilde{X}_t \in A_0] \\
&= 1 - \mathbb{P}[\text{all coordinates of } \tilde{X} \text{ have jumped by time } t] \\
&= 1 - (1 - e^{-t})^n.
\end{aligned}$$

Now consider the optimal co-adapted coupling strategy $\hat{c}_d$ as $d \rightarrow \infty$. From (3.8) we see that

$$\lambda_t^{\hat{c}_d}(m, m-1) \rightarrow m \quad \text{as } d \rightarrow \infty,$$

with all other rates tending to zero. Thus the limiting strategy $\hat{c}_\infty$ may be described as follows: let $\{\Lambda_i\}_1^n$ be independent marked unit-rate Poisson processes, with marks distributed uniformly on $[0, 1]$; flip $(\tilde{X}(i), \tilde{Y}(i))$ to (k, k) whenever there is an incident on Λ_i with mark equal to k . If $\tilde{N}$ counts the number of unmatched coordinates under this coupling, then it is clear that the only jumps in $\tilde{N}$ are of size -1, and that these occur at rate $\tilde{N}$.

The coupling time $\hat{\tau}_\infty = \inf\{t : \tilde{N}_t = 0\}$ trivially satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}[\hat{\tau}_\infty > t] &= 1 - \mathbb{P}[\text{at least one incident on all } \Lambda_i \text{ by time } t] \\
&= 1 - (1 - e^{-t})^n.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\hat{c}_\infty$ is indeed a maximal coupling. $\square$

Furthermore, if we now let $n \rightarrow \infty$, the distance between $\mathcal{L}(\tilde{X}_t)$ and π_∞^n again obeys a cutoff phenomenon, this time with cutoff time equal to $\log n$. (This may appear surprising, since $T_d \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \log n$ as $d \rightarrow \infty$. However, note that the expression on the right-hand-side of (4.2) tends to one for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ as $d \rightarrow \infty$, showing that $\frac{1}{2} \log n$ is not the cutoff time for the limiting process.)

5. Appendix: Proofs.

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.3. Equation (3.7) is an immediate consequence of [C1], which implies that no matches are ever broken under $\hat{c}_d$. When $N_t = m$ is even or satisfies $m \geq 2(d-1)/(d-2)$, it follows from [C2](i) and equation (3.3) that

$$(d-1)\lambda_t^{\hat{c}_d}(m, m-2) = \sum_{\substack{i,j \in U_t \\ i \neq j}} \hat{q}_{(i,k)(j,l)}(t) \mathbf{1}_{[k=Y_{t-}(i), l=X_{t-}(j)]} = \sum_{\substack{i,j \in U_t \\ i \neq j}} \left(\frac{1}{m-1} \right) = m.$$

Finally, [C1] and [C2] imply that, under $\hat{c}_d$, the only non-zero term in equation (3.4) is the first sum, and so

$$(d-1)\lambda_t^{\hat{c}_d}(m, m-1) = \sum_{i \in U_t} \sum_{1 \leq k \leq d} \hat{q}_{(i,k)(i,k)}(t).$$

Substituting the values of $\hat{q}_{(i,k)(i,k)}(t)$ from [C2] and [C3] completes the proof. $\square$

PROOF OF LEMMA 3.5. When $d = 2$, this result follows trivially from the explicit representation of $\hat{\tau}_d$ given in (2). For $d > 2$ however, the result is less obvious and requires a formal proof. We detail here the proof for the case when $d \geq 4$ (for which case [C2] of Definition 3.1 applies for all $m > 1$): the proof when $d = 3$ is similar, using the remark following equation (5.2) whenever [C3] applies (*i.e.* when $m \in \{1, 3\}$).

We begin by considering $\hat{v}_d(1, t)$. By (3.7) and (3.9) it follows directly that for all values of d ,

$$(5.1) \quad \hat{v}_d(1, t) = \exp\left(-\frac{dt}{d-1}\right).$$

Now consider (for $m > 1$) that part of the coupling $\hat{c}_d$ described in [C2]. From (3.8), the total rate at which N_t can change under [C2] is given by

$$\lambda_t^{\hat{c}_d}(m, m-2) + \lambda_t^{\hat{c}_d}(m, m-1) = \frac{m}{d-1} + \frac{m(d-2)}{d-1} = m.$$

Using this, along with (3.7) and (3.8), we obtain for $m > 1$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{v}_d(m, t) &= e^{-mt} + \int_0^t m e^{-mu} \left[\lambda_t^{\hat{c}}(m, m-2) \hat{v}_d(m-2, t-u) + \lambda_t^{\hat{c}}(m, m-1) \hat{v}_d(m-1, t-u) \right] du \\
 (5.2) \quad &= e^{-mt} + \int_0^t \frac{m e^{-mu}}{d-1} [m \hat{v}_d(m-2, t-u) + m(d-2) \hat{v}_d(m-1, t-u)] du.
 \end{aligned}$$

(A similar expression can be obtained for $\hat{v}_d(m, t)$ under [C3], noting that the total rate at which N_t can change in this case is $md/(d-1)$.)

Define $\hat{V}_d^\alpha(m)$ to be the Laplace transform of $\hat{v}_d(m, \cdot)$:

$$\hat{V}_d^\alpha(m) = \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} \hat{v}_d(m, t) dt.$$

It then follows from (5.2) that, for $m > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 (5.3) \quad \hat{V}_d^\alpha(m) &= \frac{1}{m+\alpha} + \frac{1}{(d-1)(m+\alpha)} \left(m \hat{V}_d^\alpha(m-2) + m(d-2) \hat{V}_d^\alpha(m-1) \right),
 \end{aligned}$$

and so (rearranging)

$$(5.4) \quad (m+\alpha)(d-1) \hat{V}_d^\alpha(m) = (d-1) + m \hat{V}_d^\alpha(m-2) + m(d-2) \hat{V}_d^\alpha(m-1).$$

Finally, with $r_d(m, t) = \hat{v}_d(m, t) - \hat{v}_d(m-1, t)$, for $\alpha \geq 0$, let

$$R_d^\alpha(m) = \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} r_d(m, t) dt.$$

We need to show that $r_d(m, t) = \hat{v}_d(m, t) - \hat{v}_d(m-1, t) \geq 0$ for all $m \geq 1$ and $t \geq 0$. By the Bernstein-Widder theorem (6, Theorem 1a, Chapter XIII.4), this is equivalent to showing that $R_d^\alpha(m)$ is totally monotone. We begin by showing that this is true when $m = 1$ and $m = 2$, and then use induction. From (5.1) we see that

$$(5.5) \quad R_d^\alpha(1) = \hat{V}_d^\alpha(1) = \frac{d-1}{d+\alpha(d-1)},$$

and is therefore totally monotone.

Furthermore, using (5.3) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 (5.6) \quad R_d^\alpha(2) &= \frac{1}{2+\alpha} + \frac{2(d-2)}{(2+\alpha)(d-1)} \hat{V}_d^\alpha(1) - \hat{V}_d^\alpha(1) = \frac{d-2}{(2+\alpha)(d+\alpha(d-1))}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Since the product of two totally monotone functions is itself totally monotone (6), it follows that $R_d^\alpha(2)$ is also totally monotone, as desired.

Now suppose that we have already shown $R_d^\alpha(m)$ and $R_d^\alpha(m-1)$ to be totally monotone, for some $m \geq 2$. Subtracting $(m+\alpha)(d-1)\hat{V}_d^\alpha(m-1)$ from both sides of (5.4) yields

$$(5.7) \quad (m+\alpha)(d-1)R_d^\alpha(m) = (d-1) \left[1 - \alpha \hat{V}_d^\alpha(m-1) \right] - mR_d^\alpha(m-1).$$

Substituting $m+1$ for m in this expression we obtain

$$(5.8) \quad (m+1+\alpha)(d-1)R_d^\alpha(m+1) = (d-1) \left[1 - \alpha \hat{V}_d^\alpha(m) \right] - (m+1)R_d^\alpha(m),$$

and then subtracting (5.7) from (5.8) yields

$$(5.9) \quad \begin{aligned} (m+1+\alpha)(d-1)R_d^\alpha(m+1) &= (d-1)\alpha \left[\hat{V}_d^\alpha(m-1) - \hat{V}_d^\alpha(m) \right] + mR_d^\alpha(m-1) \\ &\quad - [(m+1) - (m+\alpha)(d-1)] R_d^\alpha(m) \\ &= mR_d^\alpha(m-1) + [m(d-2) - 1] R_d^\alpha(m). \end{aligned}$$

Since $m \geq 2$ and $d > 2$ we see that $m(d-2) - 1 > 0$. Hence, by our induction hypothesis, $R_d^\alpha(m+1)$ can be expressed as the sum of two totally monotone functions, and so is itself totally monotone. This completes the proof. $\square$

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.6. In a similar fashion to the proof of Lemma 3.5, we show positivity of $r_d(m-1, t) - r_d(m, t)$ by showing $R_d^\alpha(m-1) - R_d^\alpha(m)$ to be totally monotone, again using induction in m . From (5.5) and (5.6) we see that

$$R_d^\alpha(1) - R_d^\alpha(2) = \frac{1}{2+\alpha}$$

and so is totally monotone. Using (5.9) it can be deduced that

$$R_d^\alpha(2) - R_d^\alpha(3) = \frac{d-4}{(2+\alpha)(3+\alpha)(d-1)}.$$

Since $d \geq 4$, this difference is also totally monotone.

Now assume that $R_d^\alpha(m-1) - R_d^\alpha(m)$ is totally monotone, for some $m \geq 3$. Substituting $m-1$ for m in (5.9) yields

$$(5.10) \quad (m+\alpha)(d-1)R_d^\alpha(m) = (m-1)R_d^\alpha(m-2) + [(m-1)(d-2) - 1] R_d^\alpha(m-1),$$

and subtracting (5.9) from (5.10) shows that

$$(m+1+\alpha)(d-1)[R_d^\alpha(m) - R_d^\alpha(m+1)] = ((m-1)(d-2)-2)[R_d^\alpha(m-1) - R_d^\alpha(m)] \\ + (m-1)[R_d^\alpha(m-2) - R_d^\alpha(m-1)] .$$

Finally, since $m \geq 3$ and $d \geq 3$, $(m-1)(d-2)-2 \geq 0$ and so it follows from our induction hypothesis that $R_d^\alpha(m) - R_d^\alpha(m+1)$ is the sum of two totally monotone functions, and hence is itself totally monotone, as claimed. $\square$

References.

- [1] ALDOUS, D. (1983). *Random walks on finite groups and rapidly mixing Markov chains* vol. 986 of *Lecture Notes in Math.* Springer, Berlin. pp. 243–297.
- [2] CONNOR, S. AND JACKA, S. (2008). Optimal co-adapted coupling for the symmetric random walk on the hypercube. *Journal of Applied Probability* **45**, 703–713.
- [3] DIACONIS, P. (1988). *Group Representations in Probability and Statistics* vol. 11 of *Lecture Notes - Monograph Series.* Institute of Mathematical Statistics.
- [4] DIACONIS, P. (1996). The cutoff phenomenon in finite Markov chains. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **93**, 1659–1664.
- [5] DIACONIS, P., GRAHAM, R. L. AND MORRISON, J. A. (1990). Asymptotic analysis of a random walk on a hypercube with many dimensions. *Random Structures Algorithms* **1**, 51–72.
- [6] FELLER (1971). *An introduction to probability theory and its applications* second ed. vol. 2. Wiley.
- [7] GRIFFEATH, D. (1975). A maximal coupling for Markov chains. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete* **31**, 95–106.
- [8] KRYLOV, N. V. (1980). *Controlled diffusion processes* vol. 14 of *Applications of Mathematics.* Springer-Verlag, New York. Translated from the Russian by A. B. Aries.
- [9] LINDVALL, T. (2002). *Lectures on the coupling method.* Dover.
- [10] SVERCHKOV, M. Y. AND SMIRNOV, S. N. (1990). Maximal coupling of D-valued processes. *Soviet Math. Dokl.* **41**, 352–354.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
UNIVERSITY OF YORK
YORK YO10 5DD, UK
E-MAIL: sbc502@york.ac.uk